



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,733	01/21/2004	W. Brent Seales	LUM0001PA/38066.1	1692
23368 7590 04/27/2009 DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP ONE DAYTON CENTRE, ONE SOUTH MAIN STREET SUITE 1300 DAYTON, OH 45402-2023			EXAMINER ALAM, FAYYAZ	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/27/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/761,733	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SEALES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FAYYAZ ALAM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 64-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 64-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to applicant's amendment/arguments filed on 1/2/2009.

**This action is made FINAL.**

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 64 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argues that it is not appropriate for the Examiner to take Official Notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. This is especially true in this particular instance since Bluetooth is infamously well-known for being susceptible to security attacks.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Bluetooth is a complete wireless protocol according the standards and the OSI layers. Bluetooth further provides security, encryption, and authentication. It is irrelevant that Bluetooth is susceptible to security attacks, since all networking systems are susceptible to attacks but they still provide some sort of security.

Nowlin is silent regarding the rejection of incoming connections and initiation of all data connection for data exchange between remote data processing and storage devices.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2618

A rejection of connection request and initiation of data connection, i.e. via a request is a well-known concept in Bluetooth and one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to configure a Bluetooth system such as that of Nowlin to perform in a manner as claimed in claim 5 (see Bluetooth specification version 1.2, vol. 2, pg. 209 of 790).

Please see rejection below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2618

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 1-9, 11-12, 64-67, 69, and 71** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nowlin et al. (USPN 2003/0092437)** and further in view of **Back et al. (USPN 2004/0024890)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Nowlin discloses a remote data processing and storage device for wireless, two-way data transfer communication with one or more data exchange infrastructure devices comprising; a housing; a power supply disposed within said housing; a microprocessor in electrical communication with said power supply and disposed within said housing; a data memory storage unit in electrical communication with said power supply and disposed within said housing; a transmitter and receiver assembly in electrical communication with said microprocessor and said power supply, said transmitter and receiver assembly being disposed within said housing for electronic wireless communication with one or more data exchange infrastructure devices; and a virtual interface preprogrammed in said microprocessor with a protocol for seeking, detecting and establishing two-way data exchange communication with at least one data exchange infrastructure device (see figs. 2,3,5; [0021,0022;0030-0033;0041-0043]).

However, Nowlin does not explicitly disclose at least one data exchange infrastructure device is selectively configured for individual use by said remote data

Art Unit: 2618

processing and storage device or for collaborative concurrent use by multiple remote data processing and storage devices.

In the related field of endeavor, Back discloses at least one data exchange infrastructure device is selectively configured for individual use by said remote data processing and storage device or for collaborative concurrent use by multiple remote data processing and storage devices (see [0040;0049;0052;0056]; figs. 3-9 and associated text, where sharing of a display and an application on a mobile terminal is made possible to a remote mobile terminal concurrently, and thus a collaborative concurrent use is selectively configured).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nowlin with the teachings of Back in order to provide a remote user terminal with sharing control of another terminal's application and display (see [0005-0008]).

Consider **claim 6** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses remote data processing and storage device is configured for operation in an environment including two or more remote data processing and storage devices (see figs. 3a-e).

Consider **claim 7** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses remote data processing and storage device is configured to accept signals from multiple data exchange infrastructure devices (see figs. 3a-e; [0043]).

Consider **claim 12** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses said transmitter and receiver assembly is configured for operation within variable, predetermined ranges.

Consider **claim 64**, Nowlin discloses a computer program, comprising a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code embodied on a remote computing device, said computer-readable program code adapted to be executed to implement a method for interfacing remote computing devices with data exchange infrastructure devices, the method comprising: preprogramming a virtual interface protocol announcing the presence of one or more data exchange infrastructure devices; detecting said announcing protocol; and establishing two-way data exchange communication with said at least one of said one or more data exchange infrastructure devices (see figs. 2,3,5; [0021,0022;0030-0033;0041-0043]). In addition, Nowlin discloses providing a system for wireless data exchange using at least one remote computing device, wherein the remote computing device comprises distinct computer modules, and wherein the distinct computer modules comprise a microprocessor, a data memory storage unit, and a transmitter and receiver assembly; preprogramming a virtual interface protocol in the microprocessor for seeking an announcing protocol from one or more data exchange (see fig. 5 and associated text; [0042-0043]).

However, Nowlin does not explicitly disclose at least one data exchange infrastructure device is selectively configured for individual use by said remote data processing and storage device or for collaborative concurrent use by multiple remote data processing and storage devices.

In the related field of endeavor, Back discloses at least one data exchange infrastructure device is selectively configured for individual use by said remote data processing and storage device or for collaborative concurrent use by multiple remote

Art Unit: 2618

data processing and storage devices (see [0040;0049;0052;0056]; figs. 3-9 and associated text, where sharing of a display and an application on a mobile terminal is made possible to a remote mobile terminal concurrently, and thus a collaborative concurrent use is selectively configured).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nowlin with the teachings of Back in order to provide a remote user terminal with sharing control of another terminal's application and display (see [0005-0008]).

Consider **claims 2 and 65** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses Bluetooth but does not explicitly disclose a security arrangement to enhance data security.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of wireless communications that Bluetooth discloses data security, encryption, and authentication.

Consider **claims 3 and 66** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses Bluetooth but does not explicitly disclose a data encrypting and decrypting arrangement.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of wireless communications that Bluetooth discloses data security, encryption, and authentication.

Consider **claims 4 and 67** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses Bluetooth but does not explicitly disclose a data verification arrangement.



However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of wireless communications that Bluetooth discloses data security, encryption, and authentication.

Consider **claim 5** as applied to respective claims, remote data processing and storage device is configured to reject any incoming connection and to thereby initiate all data connections for data exchange.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of wireless communications that Bluetooth discloses data security, encryption, and authentication.

Consider **claim 8** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses Bluetooth but does not explicitly disclose remote data processing and storage device is configured to recognize predetermined data stream structures and encode the data stream for more efficient transmission.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of wireless communications that Bluetooth discloses data security, encryption, encoding, and authentication.

Consider **claims 9 and 69** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses Bluetooth but does not explicitly disclose remote data processing and storage device interacts with a programmable channel in a data exchange infrastructure device to encode the data stream for more efficient transmission.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of wireless communications that Bluetooth discloses a programmable channel.

Consider **claims 11 and 71** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses Bluetooth but does not explicitly disclose remote data processing and storage device is configured to insure that any received input information originated with an intended data exchange infrastructure device.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of wireless communications that Bluetooth discloses communicating data using slave and master identifiers to identify source data origination.

**Claims 10 and 70** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nowlin et al. (USPN 2003/0092437)** and further in view of **Back et al. (USPN 2004/0024890)** and further in view of **Mangalik et al. (USPN 2004/0044774)**.

Consider **claims 10 and 70** as applied to respective claims, Nowlin discloses Bluetooth but does not explicitly disclose remote data processing and storage device is configured to define an execution environment to prevent access to any remote data processing and storage device resources except the data exchange stream and a predetermined amount of storage space.

In the related field of endeavor, Mangalik discloses remote data processing and storage device is configured to define an execution environment to prevent access to any remote data processing and storage device resources except a data exchange stream and a predetermined amount of storage space (see abstract; figs. 3-10 and associated text).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nowlin with the teachings of Mangalik in order to securely provide access to private information.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Fayyaz Alam whose telephone number is (571) 270-1102. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30am to 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Application/Control Number: 10/761,733

Page 12

Art Unit: 2618

*Fayyaz Alam*

April 2, 2009

/Edward Urban/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618